UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,901	03/26/2004	Hiraku Murayama	018961-068	7688
	7590 07/14/200 INGERSOLL & ROOI	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	HOEKSTRA, JEFFREY GERBEN		
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3736		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/14/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/809,901	MURAYAMA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JEFFREY G. HOEKSTRA	3736		

		JEFFREY G. HOEKSTRA	3736	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THER	EPLY FILED <u>24 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. 🔯 🛚 á á f	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe or Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) [The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acono event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire latexaminer Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
have be under 3 set fortl may ree	ons of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended from: (1) the expiration date of the solin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). CE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. 🔲 1 f N	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complibing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi DMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
	a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			
	b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,,	
(They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.12)		ected claims.	
4. 🔲	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. 🗌	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
r	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
} ((For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4 and 7-14. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☑ will not be entered, or b) □ wil ided below or appended.	l be entered and an ex	planation of
	AVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. 🔲 7 k	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
•	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation EST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
	The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Max	Hindenburg/ rvisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736			

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The Foreign References cited and provided with the IDS filed 06/24/08 would require further search and/or consideration in a patentability determination as they have not previously been considered on the merits.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues the anticipatory rejection of the claims under Chandrasekaran, specifically arguing Chandrasekaran fails to disclose, teach, and/or fairly suggest a composite guidewire, comprising inter alia: an intermediate layer formed of a mixture of the first and second materials. The Examiner disagrees, maintains the rejection as broadly as structurally claimed and as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed 03/24/08, and in response notes the following: Chandrasekaran discloses and shows the cited intermediate layer (48) (as best seen in figure 5 (column 4 line 66 - column 5 line 10). Moreover, the Examiner notes Applicant appears to rely heavily upon the claimed limitation "an intermediate layer formed of a mixture of said first material and said second material". This limitation appears to define the guidewire by structure resulting from the process by which it is "formed" and as such may to constitute a product-by-process limitation. The Examiner notes 1) product-by-process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only to the structure implied by the steps (MPEP 2112.01 and 2113) and 2) Attorney's arguments are not the kind of factual evidence that is required to reubt a prima facie case against a product-by-process limitation (MPEP 2145). With respect to 1), the Examiner maintains and reiterates as set forth above Chandrasekaran disclose and shows the structure implied by the claim language.